

REMARKS

I. Introduction

This paper is responsive to the final Office Action mailed April 24, 2009. A Request for Continued Examination (RCE) and associated fee are submitted with this paper.

Although Applicants disagree with the rejections included in the Office Action, Applicants cancel claims 1-38 and present new claims 39-54, including independent claims 39, 48, and 54, for the sake of furthering prosecution. No new matter has been added by these amendments. After entry of the amendments, claims 39-54 are pending.

II. The Pending Claims are Allowable over the Art of Record

Applicants respectfully submit the pending claims are patentable in view of the art of record and kindly request allowance of all pending claims. For example, neither U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0100589 to Ben-David, *et al.* nor U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0048560 to Sugano relate to a multi-projection system for providing images to be tiled on a screen as in the pending claims. Furthermore, Ben-David and Sugano each fail to disclose or suggest balancing color of light without reducing an overall brightness of the light in a multi-projection system as in the pending claims. Instead, both Ben-David and Sugano are directed to single projection systems that do not experience the difficulties in color balancing and brightness control that can be

experienced in multi-projection systems and that certain features of the pending claims alleviate.

Moreover, the Ben-David and Sugano fail to disclose or suggest “a main illumination source for providing main light” and “at least one secondary illumination source for providing secondary light having less optical power than the main light,” as in claim 54. Instead, Ben-David discloses a single illumination source 50 from which white light is passed through “colored filters 52 to form colored light of a defined spectral range” or passed through a collimating lens 106 and dichroic mirrors. (Ben-David ¶ [0050].) That is, Ben-David discloses **one** illumination source from which light is filtered. Nothing in Ben-David discloses or suggests using main light from a main illumination source **and** secondary light from a secondary illumination source, where the secondary light has less optical power than the main light.

Sugano fails to cure these deficiencies of Ben-David. Sugano discloses a video display apparatus with a green illumination optical system 3G for emitting green light, a red illumination optical system 3R for emitting red light, a blue illumination optical system 3B for emitting blue light, and a dichroic prism 2 for synthesizing the green light, red light, and blue light. (Sugano, ¶¶ [0035], [0037]; Figure 3.) These optical systems cannot be interpreted as a main illumination source **and** at least one secondary illumination source as in claim 54. In any event, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Sugano of secondary light that has less optical power than main light, as in claim 54.

Accordingly, the art of record fails to disclose or suggest the pending claims.

In addition, there was no reason for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine teachings from Ben-David with teachings from Sugano. Applicants thank the Examiner for his explanation of the proposed combination of teachings from Ben-David and Sugano. However, respectfully, Applicants submit that the Office failed to articulate an apparent reason to combine elements of Ben-David with elements of Sugano and to support such reason with findings of fact. (*See KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 550 U.S. 338, 82 U.S.P.Q.2d 1385, 1396 (2007).) Specifically, the Office must make the requisite factual findings based on evidence of record and explain its reasoning by which the findings are deemed to support the Office's conclusion. (*See In re Lee*, 277 F.3d 1338, 1344 (Fed. Cir. 2002).)

Applicants acknowledge that the Office made findings as to the teachings, according to the Office, of the prior art. Even assuming such findings were correct, however, Applicants submit that the Office failed to offer any articulated reason to combine the teachings of Ben-David with those of Sugano that was supported by findings of fact based on evidence of record.

First, pointing to desired characteristics (*e.g.* using a well-balanced light ratio, a high brightness display can be achieved, with superior color reproducibility, high performance and good purity) offers nothing more than a generic "desire to make things better" that would apply to anything except for the most undesirable

“improvements”. A desire to make things better is not evidence of record that supports an apparent reason to combine reference teachings.

Second, merely indicating that several rationales under *KSR* apply, without providing findings of fact based on evidence of record that support the conclusion, is also insufficient to establish an apparent reason to combine reference teachings. Furthermore, a finding that one or more features were “well-known” is not a factual finding to support an apparent reason for combining reference teachings.

Finally, the Office did state that combining the teachings of Ben-David with the teachings of Sugano would “not actually physically interfere or negatively impact the actual modulating process/lens/etc. [in the teachings of Ben-David].” (Office Action, p. 11.) With respect, Applicants submit that such a conclusion is not supported by any evidence of record. Indeed, the evidence of record supports an opposite conclusion. Ben-David teaches:

U.S. Pat. Nos. 4,800,375 and 6,097,367 both describe attempts to provide such devices. However, neither disclosed device is a suitable solution to this problem, as both devices have significant disadvantages. For example, U.S. Pat. No. 4,800,375 describes a flat, backlighted screen, in which the light source and controller form a single unit **However, since each pixel has a different color, increasing the number of primary colors both increases the cost of production, since additional light source/controller units must be added for each color,** and also decreases the resolution of the screen. Similar problems are also found with the disclosed device of U.S. Pat. No. 6,097,367, which is based on LED (light emitting diodes). (Ben-David, ¶ [0014] (emphasis added).)

In other words, Ben-David seeks to solve issues associated with using additional light sources by introducing a concept using *one* light source. No

reasonable person of ordinary skill in the art would have considered implementing the teachings from Sugano of using a light source for each of red light, green light, and blue light in a system such as Ben-David that sought to solve the problem of using multiple light sources.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that no apparent reason existed for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine teachings from Sugano with teachings from Ben-David as proposed by the Office.

Allowance of the pending claims is kindly requested.

CONCLUSION

The undersigned respectfully submits that all pending claims are in a condition for allowance. If any fees are due, such fees may be charged to Deposit Account number 11-0855. The Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney at 404-745-2520 to address any outstanding matters.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jason D. Gardner 58180/
Jason D. Gardner
Reg. No. 58180

DATE: July 23, 2009

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
1100 Peachtree Street
Suite 2800
Atlanta, Georgia, 30309-4530
404 745-2520 (direct)
404 541 4619 (direct fax)